REMARKS

It is noted that, notwithstanding any claim amendments made herein, if any, Applicants' intent is to encompass equivalents of all claim elements, even if amended herein or later during prosecution.

Claims 1-9 and 11-33 are all of the claims currently pending in the present Application. Claims 17-21 are considered as allowed. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claims 8, 9, 15, 16, 26, and 33 would be allowable if rewritten in independent format. However, Applicants believe that all claims are clearly allowable over the prior art of record and, it is noted, Applicants have previously added an independent claim in complete reliance of the Examiner's previous indication of allowable subject matter.

In this latest Office Action, claims 1-7, 11-14, 22-25, 27, and 29 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as anticipated by newly-cited US Patent 6,272,484 to Martin et al. Claim 28 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Martin, further in view of Official Notice.

These rejections are respectfully traversed in view of the following discussion.

I. THE CLAIMED INVENTION

As described and claimed (e.g., by claim 1), the present invention is directed to a method of processing search results obtained in response to a user query. Document pointers returned by a search engine are provided to identify a source from which documents are available. Each of the document pointers includes a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) displayed as part of a search result by said search engine.

At least two visual abstracts are generated for at least one of the documents, each visual abstract being a thumbnail image of a different size. A stream of data is formatted such that when said data is displayed on a display screen regarding the at least one of the documents, a smaller one of the visual abstracts appears adjacent to a corresponding search result.

An advantage of the present invention over the prior art is that a user can more easily determine relevance of the source document by seeing a thumbnail image of the document and does not need to retrieve the document itself unless it seems sufficiently relevant, thereby saving time and network bandwidth.

II. THE PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

In the latest Office Action, the Examiner newly cites Martin, alleging that this reference anticipates the present invention as defined by claims 1-7, 11-14, 22-25, 27, and 29-32 and renders obvious the definition of claim 28.

Applicants respectfully disagree, since newly-cited Martin relates to an entirely different process from that defined in the claims. Specifically, the present invention addresses the process of, as exemplarily defined in independent claim 1, "... processing search results obtained in response to a user query ...." In contrast, Martin addresses the process of "... managing electronic documents on a digital processing system or computer" (see Abstract). This prior art relates to the entirely different process of allowing the user to save documents that have been found to be of interest (e.g., lines 33-27 of column 6, lines 18-25 of column 7). The closest that Martin discusses the concept of a search is the discussion beginning at line 49 of column 8, wherein the user can initiate a search query of the user's saved documents. But even that search query does not satisfy the plain meaning of the language of the rejected claims.

Contrary to the Examiner's implication, neither Figure 5 nor Figure 6 shows the display of the search query described beginning at line 49 of column 8.

Moreover, relative to the rejection for claim 1 and contrary to the Examiner's characterization, Martin does not teach or suggest generating two thumbnail images of different sizes of the same original document. There is a single thumbnail image that is generated and saved. The reference in lines 34-40 of column 7 to different sizes refers to have different sizes and shapes of the original document that is being saved, not the concept of providing two thumbnail images of different sizes. Therefore, the final limitations of claim 1 are clearly allowable over Martin.

Hence, turning to the clear language of the claims, in Martin there is no teaching or suggestion of: "A method of processing search results obtained in response to a user query, the method comprising: providing document pointers returned by a search engine to identify a source from which documents are available, each said document pointer including a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) displayed as part of a search result by said search engine; generating at least two

visual abstracts for at least one of said documents, each of said two visual abstracts being a thumbnail image of a different size; and formatting a stream of data such that when said data is displayed on a display screen regarding said at least one of said documents, a smaller one of said visual abstracts appears adjacent to a corresponding search result", as required by independent claim 1. The remaining independent claims have similar language.

Relative to the rejection for claim 2, 23, 24, and 31, Martin uses a simple data compression. The description at lines 11-25 of column 7 does not in any way suggest an "enhancement" of a portion of the image before it is compressed. If the Examiner persists in this rejection, Applicants request that the Examiner pinpoint the precise wording intended to be relied upon for Appeal.

Relative to the rejection for claims 3 and 4, the description to which the Examiner points at lines 11-25 of column 7 makes no reference to a filtering process used for manipulating the original image for purpose of enhancing a visibility of a portion of that image. The description in these lines is nothing but routine image data compression, which would not result in a selective enhancement of any portion of the image.

Relative to the rejection for claims 5, 13, and 14, the description at lines 6-16 of column 8 has nothing to do with displaying a larger visual abstract. Rather, at best, this description describes the ability of the user to select whether the image is retrieved from its original location, considered to be the first location, or from the data file, considered to be the second location. There is no reference to a second, larger visual abstract. It is noted that a full size image retrieved from the first location would fail to satisfy the description of being a visual abstract.

Relative to the rejection for claims 6, 7, 12, 25, 29, and 32, similarly to the observation above relative to claim 5, Martin does not suggest a second, larger visual abstract. The discussion in Martin relates only to "first location" and "second location", not two different-sized abstracts of the original image.

Relative to the rejection for claims 11 and 22, again, in addition to the comments concerning the rejection for claim 1, there is no suggestion in Martin of a larger abstract image.

Relative to the rejection for claim 27, the "C" drive is not a cache memory.

Relative to the rejection for claim 28, wherein the Examiner invoked Official Notice, Applicants request that the Examiner provide a reference properly combinable with Martin. It is noted that this claim does not refer to a simple cache, wherein a data replacement algorithm is used to determine when new data requirements necessitate that data currently in the cache be deleted. Rather, the plain meaning of the claim language involve a "cache database". As exemplarily discussed in lines 11-15 of page 10, this involves a concept beyond that of the normal cache data replacement algorithms, since this exemplary implementation uses a cache data replacement process that is inherent to the application program itself, rather than background cache management typically under control of an operating system.

III. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-9 and 11-33, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Assignee's Deposit Account No. 09-0441.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 1/19/06

Frederick E. Cooperrider
Reg. No. 36,769

McGinn Intellectual Property Law Group, PLLC
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200
Vienna, Virginia 22182
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254